

Appl. No. 09/171,910

### REMARKS

This is a supplemental amendment following an Amendment filed on November 16, 2001.

Claims 31-50 and newly added claims 51-54, presented in the Response filed November 16, 2001, have been cancelled and are being replaced with renumbered claims 55-74 to remove confusion with regard to the renumbering and because the Version with Markings of our Amendment filed November 16, 2001, may not have properly indicated the previous form of the claims.

New claims 55, 56, 57 and 58 correspond to claims 31, 34, 51 and 37, respectively, of our Amendment filed on November 16, 2001.

New claims 59, 60, 61 and 62 correspond to claims 35, 52, 36 and 47, respectively, of our Amendment filed on November 16, 2001.

New claims 63, 64, 65 and 66 correspond to claims 48, 53, 42 and 38, respectively, of our Amendment filed on November 16, 2001.

New claims 67, 68, 69 and 70 correspond to claims 49, 40, 32 and 46, respectively, of our Amendment filed on November 16, 2001.

New claims 71, 72, 73, and 74 correspond to claims 43, 44, 45 and 50, respectively, of our Amendment filed on November 16, 2001.

In regard to the election of species, the Applicants elect Group D with traverse. Claims readable on the elected Group D are renumbered claims 60-68.

In further regard to election of Group D, Applicants elect Group G with traverse. The claim readable on elected Group G is 67.

Appl. No. 09/171,910

The election requirement is traversed because a thorough and adequate search can be performed without the need for a species election. The Examiner has already conducted a search as evidenced by the citation of U.S. Patent No. 5,082,605 to Brooks et al. Any additional searching related to particles would necessarily encompass all species of the instant application. Requiring the Applicants to file divisional applications so as to encompass all of their instant invention would result in undue expense and burden.

Therefore, reconsideration of the requirement to elect is requested, as is favorable consideration of new claims 55-74.

With respect to U.S. Patent No. 5,082,605 to Brooks et al., it is remarked that Brooks neither discloses nor suggests using the two kinds of particles specified in renumbered claim 55 (previous claim 31). The smaller particles form a reinforcement of the product in all directions, thus also in a directional component in a direction transverse to the direction of orientation of the large particles. In addition, the smaller particles, randomly oriented, increase the resistance to splitting.


The Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned if the Examiner believes such would facilitate prosecution of the present application.

The undersigned is available for telephone consultation at any time during normal business hours (Pacific Time Zone).

Appl. No. 09/171,910

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 19, 2001

By:   
Deepak Malhotra  
Reg. No. 33,560

Application Serial No. .... 09/171,910  
Filing Date ..... May 13, 1999  
Inventor ..... Dirk Van Dijk et al.  
Assignee ..... Tech-Wood International Limited  
Group Art Unit ..... 1772  
Examiner ..... Alicia Chevalier  
Attorney's Docket No. .... VR2-002  
Title: Plastic-Based Composite Product and Method and Apparatus for  
Manufacturing Same

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE ACCOMPANYING  
SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO OCTOBER 19, 2001 OFFICE ACTION

In the Claims

The claims have been amended as follows. Underlines indicate insertions  
and ~~strikeouts~~ indicate deletions.

All claims have been cancelled.

New claims 55-74 have been added.

**-END OF DOCUMENT-**